

January 28, 1976

PRESIDENT: Senator Goodrich.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Would Senator Warner yield to a question? I want to have a little discourse between Senator Warner and myself. Actually, if that is agreeable with Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: It is agreeable with me if it is alright with everyone else.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Now, what you are saying in essence is that if the county takes advantage and receives this money that we are in affect lowering the mill levy limit for that particular county by saying that they must reduce their mill levy by the like amount that they receive from 202, is that in essence what you are saying?

SENATOR WARNER: That sounds about as clear as I have put it I think, yes.

SENATOR GOODRICH: What do you do Senator Warner if you have a county for instance that is already deeply in the hole and they just can't live with this particular amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator I think that the point that I am attempting to make with the amendment Senator Goodrich is that if this is indeed additional spending, which is one avenue, then it should be called that. The other approach is that were relieving the load of property tax for this purpose and that is the intent of the legislation and in this amendment insures that goal, now that is not the goal it is merely to provide more money to spend, then the amendment should not be adopted.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Well, thank you for your answer. Mr. President, members of the body, I would have to oppose this amendment because there are any number of these counties, in fact I think the total is about 33 counties out of the 93 counties that are at their mill levy limits. For example in their mental health, their mental retardation and those other human resource spending, they just plainly just haven't been able to keep up with the pace because it bumped into their mill levy limit. For that reason if were going to give them this relief, the form of relief in 202 and then tell them that they can't use that money for meeting the other human needs of their county, I don't think that we should be doing that. I would suggest that if were going to assume this obligation on behalf of the counties then lets assume this obligation. But lets don't try and tell the county that they can't use the resources that they save from this appropriated state money for meeting of human services needs of their county that are the other needs for instance. I will just not buy this particular portion of the Warner amendment, just this amendment. I'm sure for example that of the 33 counties that are up to their mill levy limit they would not buy this same amendment because frankly it is taking control away from them as to what they can and can't do and spending the county's money. They have got unmet needs in human services areas and this would stop them from meeting those needs. I would suggest that we reject this amendment.